Estimates of Impact of Local Option Meals Tax

January 2009

Explanation of methodology and data limitations

DISCLAIMER: General limitation of DOR returns data for meals taxes

DOR data contains addresses for meals tax returns, or taxpayer registrations, as part of their return. However, businesses that operate in more than one location in Massachusetts generally file a single meals tax return covering all of the locations in the state. In the data kept by DOR, these meals would all be attributed to the address listed on the return, or registration. Take for example a theoretical business that has two locations, one in Sheffield and one in Cambridge. If this business files a single return from Sheffield listing meals tax from both locations, then the data from the meals tax returns would be placed under the "Sheffield" category, even though some of the meals tax was not generated by sales in that locality.

Similarly, meals tax from restaurants that are part of a chain may be filed together under the address of the corporate headquarters. If this address is out-of-state, then the meals tax from this chain might not appear in any of the local tallies, and would need to be distributed among the cities and towns. Furthermore, a business can have its return filed by a third party, such as an accountant, with the address of this party on its return. In this case, our data may show the meals tax in the city or town in which the accountant's office is located. For these reasons, DOR returns data does not well represent the amounts of economic activity taking place in any particular city or town.

Two Methods: Using DOR Returns Data and U.S. Census Data

Two methods are presented to estimate the impact of a 1% increase in the meals tax that raises a total of \$125 million in new tax revenues. The first uses DOR meals tax return data to allocate this increase. The second method uses data gathered by the US Census bureau as part of its 2002 Economic Census of business activity.

Method 1: DOR Meals Tax Returns

The accompanying spreadsheet lists all 351 cities and towns in Massachusetts in alphabetical order. The first method uses 2007 meals taxes (by town) obtained from DOR's meals tax return data for taxable receipts. These data are subject to the data limitations described in the disclaimer. Also note that towns from which fewer than three taxpayers filed tax returns in

any given year are excluded from these data to ensure the confidentiality of taxpayer-specific information.

This method uses the percentage of meals taxes reported by each town in the 2007 meals tax return data to allocate the revenue that would be generated by a 1% increase in the meals tax. For the meals tax revenue reported from out-of-state taxpayers, revenue was distributed to Massachusetts cities and towns proportionately, based on the percentage of in-state meals tax revenue attributable to each city and town.

Method 2: U.S. Census Data

Using food service industry data from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2002 Economic Census of Business Activity (the most recent available), the Department of Revenue estimated the proportion of total restaurant activity (and thus meals tax revenue) for each of the Commonwealth's 351 cities and towns. The 2002 census provided the following information: total food service (mostly restaurant) sales and the number of food service establishments for the state as a whole; food service sales for the larger individual towns; and the number of food service establishments for many of the smaller towns in Massachusetts. These data were used to allocate meals taxes to individual towns. However, for some towns (mainly the smallest ones), there were neither sales nor establishment data available from the Census Bureau. Where no sales or establishment data were available, the remaining meals tax was allocated based on population.

The percentages of total restaurant activity for each city and town were then used to allocate the approximately \$125 million in new meals tax revenue.

Note on Estimates

The actual impact of the proposal to increase the meals tax rate in any given city or town depends on several factors, including how many establishments actually exist, their future sales, and how customers would react to an increase in the meals tax. Customers' reactions may be especially important if contiguous towns (whether inside or outside Massachusetts) opt for different local option taxes or none at all. While the Department of Revenue believes that in general the Census-based estimates to be preferable to the meals tax return-based estimates, in some cases the estimates based on meals tax returns may be more accurate, especially where Census data on sales and the number of food service establishments were unavailable.

It should also be noted that the method based on the 2002 U.S. Census data implicitly assumes that the distribution of restaurant sales among cities and towns has not changed since 2002. DOR believes that while this is a reasonable assumption, there are probably some cases in which this assumption does not hold, and that the estimates should therefore be used with caution.

(This method uses 2007 Meals Tax Return data to distribute the Aggregate Revenue Impact. Meals Tax From Out-of-State Returns (Mostly Restaurant Chains) is Distributed Proportionately to In-State Cities and Towns)

Method: Using U.S. Census Department Data on Restaurant Sales, Number of Restaurants, or Population in a Locality

(This method uses MA Economic Census data for NAICS code 722 (Food Services) to distribute the Aggregate Revenue Impact -- see footnotes)

| CITIES and TOWNS | to In-State Cities and Towns) | Aggregate Revenue Impact see footnotes) |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| (001) Abington | 235,268 | 308,659 |
| (002) Acton | 320,817 | 305,519 E |
| (003) Acushnet | 72,925 | 102,475 |
| (004) Adams | 65,783 | 267,897 P |
| (005) Agawam | 622,639 | 294,311 |
| (006) Alford | ** | 9,722 P |
| (007) Amesbury | 166,300 | 174,582 E |
| (008) Amherst | 465,788 | 468,109 |
| (009) Andover | 567,860 | 657,140 |
| (010) Arlington | 300,245 | 480,101 E |
| (011) Ashburnham | 16,084 | 75,356 P |
| (012) Ashby | 3,143 | 32,181 P |
| (013) Ashfield | 13,010 | 21,308 P |
| (014) Ashland | 154,570 | 237,698 |
| (015) Athol | 96,033 | 96,690 |
| (016) Attleboro | 617,585 | 538,295 E |
| (017) Auburn | 276,873 | 298,244 E |
| (018) Avon | 126,724 | 79,827 P |
| (019) Ayer | 93,118 | 65,979 P |
| (020) Barnstable | 1,598,593 | 1,626,187 |
| (021) Barre | 41,841 | 62,289 P |
| (022) Becket | 9,193 | 45,083 P |
| (023) Bedford | 473,214 | 293,882 |
| (024) Belchertown | 120,313 | 189,447 |
| (025) Bellingham | 175,743 | 247,325 E |
| (026) Belmont | 158,410 | 200,977 |
| (027) Berkley | 59,499 | 81,352 P |
| (028) Berlin | 9,662 | 32,458 P |
| (029) Bernardston | 38,248 | 31,745 P |
| (030) Beverly | 580,102 | 691,054 E |
| (031) Billerica | 536,868 | 560,117 E |
| (032) Blackstone | 50,419 | 106,079 P |
| (033) Blandford | 3,123 | 18,857 P |
| (034) Bolton | 79,467 | 62,586 P |
| (035) Boston | 24,640,591 | 23,345,650 |
| (036) Bourne | 286,342 | 501,757 |
| (037) Boxborough | 58,992 | 54,668 P |
| (038) Boxford | 34,703 | 154,392 P |
| (039) Boylston | 71,221 | 56,747 P |
| (040) Braintree | 704,423 | 1,167,299 |
| (041) Brewster | 212,427 | 90,301 |
| (042) Bridgewater | 213,825 | 431,494 |
| (043) Brimfield | 14,102 | 55,138 P |
| (044) Brockton | 942,939 | 1,322,547 |
| (045) Brookfield | 19,490 | 38,980 P |
| (046) Brookline | 1,162,366 | 1,192,250 |
| (047) Buckland | ** | 3,514 P |
| (048) Burlington | 1,036,597 | 1,230,582 |
| (049) Cambridge | 3,878,354 | 4,058,091 |
| (050) Canton | 534,297 | 509,957 |
| (051) Carlisle | 49,169 | 53,092 P |

(This method uses 2007 Meals Tax Return data to distribute the Aggregate Revenue Impact. Meals Tax From Out-of-State Returns (Mostly Restaurant Chains) is Distributed Proportionately

Method: Using U.S. Census Department Data on Restaurant Sales, Number of Restaurants, or Population in a Locality

(This method uses MA Economic Census data for NAICS code 722 (Food Services) to distribute the Aggregate Revenue Impact -- see footnotes)

| CITIES and TOWNS | to In-State Cities and Towns) | Aggregate Rei |
|------------------------|--|-----------------|
| | , and the second se | 7 iggregate Net |
| (052) Carver | 139,672 | |
| (053) Charlemont | 15,994 | |
| (054) Charlton | 77,664 | |
| (055) Chatham | 432,261 | |
| (056) Chelmsford | 342,459 | |
| (057) Chelsea | 537,727 | |
| (058) Cheshire | 8,306 | |
| (059) Chester | 5,519 | |
| (060) Chesterfield | ** | |
| (061) Chicopee | 2,088,168 | |
| (062) Chilmark | 34,800 | |
| (063) Clarksburg | 3,945 | |
| (064) Clinton | 140,325 | |
| (065) Cohasset | 181,927 | |
| (066) Colrain | ** | |
| (067) Concord | 379,931 | |
| (068) Conway | 2,036 | |
| (069) Cummington | 5,627 | |
| (070) Dalton | 36,291 | |
| (071) Danvers | 643,952 | |
| (072) Dartmouth | 445,102 | |
| (073) Dedham | 2,463,457 | |
| (074) Deerfield | 109,807 | |
| (075) Dennis | 569,624 | |
| (076) Dighton | 35,785 | |
| (077) Douglas | 31,746 | |
| (078) Dover | 7,796 | |
| (079) Dracut | 269,368 | |
| (080) Dudley | 79,309 | |
| (081) Dunstable | 7,881 | |
| (082) Duxbury | 89,727 | |
| (083) East Bridgewater | 111,243 | |
| (084) East Brookfield | 17,811 | |
| (085) East Longmeadow | 158,928 | |
| (086) Eastham | 136,687 | |
| (087) Easthampton | 153,115 | |
| (088) Easton | 318,550 | |
| (089) Edgartown | 352,582 | |
| (090) Egremont | 41,660 | |
| (091) Erving | 9,895 | |
| (092) Essex | 226,642 | |
| (093) Everett | 378,356 | |
| (094) Fairhaven | 325,741 | |
| (095) Fall River | 873,789 | |
| (096) Falmouth | 945,479 | |
| (097) Fitchburg | 343,009 | |
| (098) Florida | ** | |
| (099) Foxborough | 628,332 | |
| (100) Framingham | 925,168 | |
| (101) Franklin | 567,400 | |
| • | · | |

114,856

(102) Freetown

| oact | see | footi |
|-------|------|-------|
| | ,388 | |
| | ,719 | Р |
| 189 | ,131 | Ε |
| 466 | ,768 | Р |
| | ,649 | |
| 436 | ,455 | |
| | ,473 | |
| | ,150 | |
| | ,792 | Р |
| | ,402 | |
| | ,807 | Р |
| | ,198 | |
| | ,599 | |
| | ,663 | |
| | ,988 | |
| | ,502 | |
| | ,732 | |
| | ,010 | |
| | ,804 | Р |
| 1,082 | | |
| 906 | ,475 | |
| | ,616 | Ε |
| | ,538 | Р |
| | ,093 | |
| | ,168 | Р |
| | ,678 | Р |
| 115 | ,594 | Р |
| | ,899 | |
| | ,157 | |
| | ,676 | Р |
| | ,114 | Ε |
| | ,093 | |
| | ,656 | Р |
| 232 | ,776 | Ε |
| 370 | ,445 | Р |
| 149 | ,075 | |
| 400 | ,879 | |
| 243 | ,447 | Р |
| | ,058 | Р |
| 19 | ,289 | Р |
| 55 | ,793 | Р |
| 516 | ,472 | Ε |
| 370 | ,987 | Ε |
| 1,218 | | |
| | ,941 | |
| | ,522 | |
| | ,725 | Р |
| | ,115 | |
| 1,785 | | |
| | ,033 | |
| 115 | ,330 | Р |
| | | |

572,300

Method: Using DOR Returns

(This method uses 2007 Meals Tax Return data to distribute the Aggregate Revenue Impact. Meals Tax From Out-of-State Returns (Mostly Postaurant Chains) is Distributed Proportionately

Method: Using U.S. Census Department Data on Restaurant Sales, Number of Restaurants, or Population in a Locality

(This method uses MA Economic Census data for NAICS code 722 (Food Services) to distribute the Aggregate Revenue otnotes)

(153) Leominster

| | Restaurant Chains) is Distributed Proportionately |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| CITIES and TOWNS | to In-State Cities and Towns) |
| (103) Gardner | 223,881 |
| (104) Aquinnah | 10,093 |
| (105) Georgetown | 93,459 |
| (106) Gill | 9,571 |
| (107) Gloucester | 550,134 |
| (108) Goshen | 2,178 |
| (109) Gosnold | 2,810 |
| (110) Grafton | 147,153 |
| (111) Granby | 17,870 |
| (112) Granville | 21,393 |
| (113) Great Barrington | 296,733 |
| (114) Greenfield | 225,184 |
| (115) Groton | 116,533 |
| (116) Groveland | 24,400 |
| (117) Hadley | 164,691 |
| (118) Halifax | 115,036 |
| (119) Hamilton | 65,924 |
| (120) Hampden | 70,331 |
| (121) Hancock | 7,896 |
| (122) Hanover | 218,082 |
| (123) Hanson | 143,900 |
| (124) Hardwick | 5,457 |
| (125) Harvard | 15,769 |
| (126) Harwich | 399,153 |
| (127) Hatfield | 28,361 |
| (128) Haverhill | 890,874 |
| (129) Hawley | ** |
| (130) Heath | ** |
| (131) Hingham | 606,938 |
| (132) Hinsdale | 10,311 |
| (133) Holbrook | 77,287 |
| (134) Holden | 177,889 |
| (135) Holland | 3,684 |
| (136) Holliston | 54,245 |
| (137) Holyoke | 462,081 |
| (138) Hopedale | 11,914 |
| (139) Hopkinton | 116,094 |
| (140) Hubbardston | 6,989 |
| (141) Hudson | 197,050 |
| (142) Hull | 188,662 8,229 |
| (143) Huntington (144) Ipswich | |
| , , , | 225,085 460,602 |
| (145) Kingston (146) Lakeville | 79,112 |
| (147) Lancaster | 12,614 |
| (148) Lanesborough | 193,735 |
| (149) Lawrence | 483,799 |
| (150) Lee | 200,323 |
| (151) Leicester | 91,089 |
| (152) Lenox | 396,226 |
| (152) Learnington | 570,220 |

| nd Ser | | • | |
|--------|-----|-------|-----|
| e Impa | 1Ct | see | foo |
| | 254 | ,599 | Ε |
| | | ,843 | Р |
| | 143 | ,304 | Р |
| | 17 | ,585 | Р |
| | 664 | ,643 | |
| | 9 | ,514 | Р |
| | 2 | ,546 | Р |
| | 203 | .679 | Ε |
| | 108 | ,184 | Р |
| | 23 | ,292 | Р |
| | | ,121 | Р |
| | | ,192 | |
| | | ,896 | Р |
| | | ,820 | Р |
| | 81 | ,990 | Р |
| | 116 | ,718 | Р |
| | | ,628 | Р |
| | | ,195 | Р |
| | | ,353 | Р |
| | 403 | ,644 | |
| | 160 | ,868, | Р |
| | 22 | ,503 | Р |
| | | ,455 | Р |
| | 234 | ,450 | |
| | 57 | ,702 | Р |
| | 880 | ,184 | Ε |
| | | ,901 | Р |
| | | ,084 | Р |
| | 463 | ,666 | |
| | | ,544 | Р |
| | 127 | ,385 | |
| | 172 | ,281 | |
| | 34 | ,109 | Р |
| | 92 | ,127 | |
| | 846 | ,775 | |
| | 75 | ,803 | Р |
| | 113 | ,239 | |
| | | ,734 | Р |
| | 247 | ,604 | |
| | | ,405 | Ε |
| | | ,651 | Р |
| | | ,752 | |
| | 210 | ,953 | Ε |
| | 163 | ,253 | Р |
| | | ,683 | Р |
| | | ,667 | Р |
| | | ,940 | Ε |
| | | ,412 | Р |
| | | ,976 | |
| | 166 | ,845 | Р |
| | 001 | 777 | |

826,777

(This method uses 2007 Meals Tax Return data to distribute the Aggregate Revenue Impact. Meals Tax From Out-of-State Returns (Mostly Restaurant Chains) is Distributed Proportionately to In-State Cities and Towns)

Method: Using U.S. Census Department Data on Restaurant Sales, Number of Restaurants, or Population in a Locality

(This method uses MA Economic Census data for NAICS code 722 (Food Services) to distribute the Aggregate Revenue Impact -- see footnotes)

| CITIES and TOWNS | to In-State Cities and Towns) | Aggregate Revenue Impact see footnotes) |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| (154) Leverett | ** | 23,551 P |
| (155) Lexington | 471,474 | 447,694 |
| (156) Leyden | 870 | 9,929 P |
| (157) Lincoln | 4,635 | 53,651 P |
| (158) Littleton | 45,652 | 89,900 P |
| (159) Longmeadow | 97,727 | 114,594 |
| (160) Lowell | 1,130,654 | 1,188,236 |
| (161) Ludlow | 206,753 | 261,482 |
| (162) Lunenburg | 94,976 | 124,106 P |
| (163) Lynn | 622,433 | 662,495 |
| (164) Lynnfield | 70,563 | 275,547 |
| (165) Malden | 455,522 | 556,960 |
| (166) Manchester | 74,926 | 89,216 P |
| (167) Mansfield | 257,751 | 232,776 E |
| (168) Marblehead | 269,140 | 235,658 |
| (169) Marion | 52,486 | 76,564 P |
| (170) Marlborough | 577,477 | 927,748 |
| (171) Marshfield | 600,751 | 312,793 E |
| (172) Mashpee | 270,439 | 210,953 E |
| (173) Mattapoisett | 108,013 | 96,546 P |
| (174) Maynard | 415,204 | 220,693 |
| (175) Medfield | 96,936 | 110,045 |
| (176) Medford | 361,042 | 516,472 E |
| (177) Medway | 151,110 | 135,036 |
| (178) Melrose | 143,600 | 203,674 |
| (179) Mendon | 94,387 | 74,823 P |
| (180) Merrimac | 27,816 | 106,964 P |
| (181) Methuen | 512,542 | 523,746 E |
| (182) Middleborough | 335,047 | 430,286 |
| (183) Middlefield | ** | 5,807 P |
| (184) Middleton | 216,076 | 133,657 P |
| (185) Milford | 498,876 | 632,310 |
| (186) Millbury | 148,539 | 72,974 |
| (187) Millis | 88,850 | 154,586 P |
| (188) Millville | 3,626 | 38,472 P |
| (189) Milton | 124,444 | 109,114 E |
| (190) Monroe | ** | 733 P |
| (191) Monson | 22,584 | 124,335 P |
| (192) Montague | 75,736 | 113,926 P |
| (193) Monterey | ** | 21,463 P |
| (194) Montgomery | ** | 11,721 P |
| (195) Mount Washington | ** | 3,663 P |
| (196) Nahant | 73,364 | 58,991 P |
| (197) Nantucket | 1,017,422 | 741,421 P |
| (198) Natick | 654,254 | 581,940 E |
| (199) Needham | 792,516 | 349,164 E |
| (200) New Ashford | ** | 5,682 P |
| (201) New Bedford | 1,177,014 | 1,174,600 |
| (202) New Braintree | ** | 15,746 P |
| (203) New Marlborough | 28,531 | 35,498 P |
| (204) New Salem | 20,031 | 13,323 P |
| (207) NOW SUICH | | 13,323 1 |

(This method uses 2007 Meals Tax Return data to distribute the Aggregate Revenue Impact. Meals Tax From Out-of-State Returns (Mostly Restaurant Chains) is Distributed Proportionately

Method: Using U.S. Census Department Data on Restaurant Sales, Number of Restaurants, or Population in a Locality

(This method uses MA Economic Census data for NAICS code 722 (Food Services) to distribute the otes)

| CITIES and TOWNS | to In-State Cities and Towns) | Aggregate Revenue Impact see footno |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (205) Newbury | 22,758 | 116,910 P |
| (206) Newburyport | 495,524 | 436,455 E |
| (207) Newton | 1,823,930 | 1,997,337 |
| (208) Norfolk | 127,583 | 74,745 |
| (209) North Adams | 253,678 | 341,890 E |
| (210) North Andover | 502,394 | 341,890 E |
| (211) North Attleborough | 404,557 | 541,713 |
| (212) North Brookfield | 23,978 | 54,738 P |
| (213) North Reading | 218,332 | 263,642 |
| (214) Northampton | 948,117 | 778,606 |
| (215) Northborough | 1,429,978 | 247,325 E |
| (216) Northbridge | 57,466 | 121,117 |
| (217) Northfield | 8,342 | 45,547 P |
| (218) Norton | 246,071 | 232,776 E |
| (219) Norwell | 103,210 | 171,720 P |
| (220) Norwood | 894,758 | 687,996 |
| (221) Oak Bluffs | 289,613 | 137,468 P |
| (222) Oakham | 2,278 | 24,734 P |
| (223) Orange | 89,542 | 100,827 P |
| (224) Orleans | 356,938 | 490,661 P |
| (225) Otis | 13,589 | 43,885 P |
| (226) Oxford | 215,048 | 138,211 E |
| (227) Palmer | 171,249 | 159,665 |
| (228) Paxton | 8,941 | 54,837 P |
| (229) Peabody | 928,943 | 1,341,230 |
| (230) Pelham | /ZU,/10 ** | 18,922 P |
| (231) Pembroke | 274,792 | 225,502 E |
| (232) Pepperell | 25,704 | 38,467 |
| (233) Peru | 20,704 ** | 19,683 P |
| (234) Petersham | 3,742 | 14,481 P |
| (235) Phillipston | 15,239 | 20,693 P |
| (236) Pittsfield | 697,666 | 743,710 |
| (237) Plainfield | ** | 8,684 P |
| (238) Plainville | 171,874 | 159,424 P |
| (239) Plymouth | 2,010,354 | 878,209 |
| (240) Plympton | 6,229 | 44,119 P |
| (241) Princeton | 79,696 | 45,018 P |
| (242) Provincetown | 624,675 | 238,773 P |
| (243) Quincy | 1,815,783 | 1,454,850 E |
| (244) Randolph | 370,854 | 443,729 E |
| (245) Raynham | 264,785 | 327,341 E |
| (246) Reading | 234,531 | 190,320 |
| (247) Rehoboth | 95,971 | 57,821 |
| (248) Revere | 769,971 | 57,621 596,489 E |
| (249) Richmond | 812 | 39,538 P |
| (250) Rochester | 11,474 | 82,614 P |
| (251) Rockland | 368,266 | 339,596 |
| (252) Rockport | 102,794 | 119,476 P |
| (253) Rowe | 102,774 ** | 8,643 P |
| (254) Rowley | 222,428 | 103,643 P |
| (255) Royalston | ZZZ,4ZO ** | 13,787 P |
| (200) Noyalston | | 13,707 F |

(This method uses 2007 Meals Tax Return data to distribute the Aggregate Revenue Impact. Meals Tax From Out-of-State Returns (Mostly Restaurant Chains) is Distributed Proportionately to In-State Cities and Towns)

Method: Using U.S. Census Department Data on Restaurant Sales, Number of Restaurants, or Population in a Locality

(This method uses MA Economic Census data for NAICS code 722 (Food Services) to distribute the Anarenate Revenue Impact -- see footnotes)

| CITIES and TOWNS | to In-State Cities and Towns) | Aggregate Revenue Impact see foot |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| (256) Russell | 11,451 | 23,398 P |
| (257) Rutland | 36,525 | 96,061 P |
| (258) Salem | 1,042,631 | 835,420 |
| (259) Salisbury | 224,325 | 125,485 P |
| (260) Sandisfield | 5,523 | 19,546 P |
| (261) Sandwich | 403,856 | 263,723 |
| (262) Saugus | 785,714 | 1,378,261 |
| (263) Savoy | /00 ₁ /14 ** | 22,627 P |
| (264) Scituate | 302,376 | 181,856 E |
| (265) Seekonk | 534,045 | 861,123 |
| (266) Sharon | 98,505 | 137,921 |
| (267) Sheffield | 23,502 | 100,607 P |
| (268) Shelburne | | 54,907 P |
| | 39,647 | |
| (269) Sherborn | 63,396 | 47,132 P |
| (270) Shirley | 24,879 | 56,001 P |
| (271) Shrewsbury | 584,820 | 503,743 |
| (272) Shutesbury | 1,133 | 20,366 P |
| (273) Somerset | 241,620 | 210,953 E |
| (274) Somerville | 988,870 | 1,112,960 E |
| (275) South Hadley | 136,235 | 195,353 |
| (276) Southampton | 188,826 | 100,647 P |
| (277) Southborough | 278,062 | 127,515 P |
| (278) Southbridge | 83,384 | 127,573 |
| (279) Southwick | 117,112 | 142,755 P |
| (280) Spencer | 107,964 | 130,937 E |
| (281) Springfield | 1,768,060 | 2,024,301 |
| (282) Sterling | 156,909 | 100,326 P |
| (283) Stockbridge | 21,270 | 48,232 P |
| (284) Stoneham | 303,860 | 371,875 |
| (285) Stoughton | 401,107 | 421,907 E |
| (286) Stow | 79,695 | 69,121 P |
| (287) Sturbridge | 312,331 | 118,713 P |
| (288) Sudbury | 266,983 | 181,856 E |
| (289) Sunderland | 44,487 | 46,115 P |
| (290) Sutton | 64,505 | 114,745 P |
| (291) Swampscott | 329,118 | 152,759 E |
| (292) Swansea | 696,107 | 247,325 E |
| (293) Taunton | 586,204 | 785,619 E |
| (294) Templeton | 37,473 | 90,656 P |
| (295) Tewksbury | 1,898,631 | 663,918 |
| (296) Tisbury | 188,242 | 327,344 P |
| (297) Tolland | ** | 5,023 P |
| (298) Topsfield | 15,970 | 109,811 P |
| (299) Townsend | 92,922 | 93,989 P |
| (300) Truro | 35,928 | 134,536 P |
| (301) Tyngsborough | 168,411 | 210,953 E |
| (302) Tyringham | ** | 6,093 P |
| (303) Upton | 26,568 | 88,858 P |
| (304) Uxbridge | 127,245 | 152,759 E |
| (305) Wakefield | 269,737 | 320,067 E |
| (306) Wales | 4,274 | 24,725 P |
| | | · · |

(This method uses 2007 Meals Tax Return data to distribute the Aggregate Revenue Impact. Meals Tax From Out-of-State Returns (Mostly Restaurant Chains) is Distributed Proportionately to In-State Cities and Towns)

Method: Using U.S. Census Department Data on Restaurant Sales, Number of Restaurants, or Population in a Locality

(This method uses MA Economic Census data for NAICS code 722 (Food Services) to distribute the Aggregate Revenue Impact -- see footnotes)

| CITIES and TOWNS | to in-state cities and rowns) | Aggregate Revenue Impact see tootholes) |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| (307) Walpole | 592,928 | 312,793 E |
| (308) Waltham | 1,223,804 | 1,699,912 |
| (309) Ware | 124,997 | 165,992 P |
| (310) Wareham | 456,544 | 536,157 |
| (311) Warren | 9,571 | 50,709 P |
| (312) Warwick | ** | 10,138 P |
| (313) Washington | ** | 16,123 P |
| (314) Watertown | 637,369 | 574,666 E |
| (315) Wayland | 534,895 | 145,485 E |
| (316) Webster | 225,030 | 261,873 E |
| (317) Wellesley | 594,236 | 487,375 E |
| (318) Wellfleet | 233,431 | 210,434 P |
| (319) Wendell | ** | 10,781 P |
| (320) Wenham | 108,418 | 65,756 P |
| (321) West Boylston | 268,227 | 80,390 P |
| | 228,299 | 97,004 P |
| (322) West Bridgewater | | |
| (323) West Brookfield | 68,984 | 47,869 P |
| (324) West Newbury | 9,059 | 78,250 P |
| (325) West Springfield | 627,924 | 910,233 |
| (326) West Stockbridge | 25,659 | 37,963 P |
| (327) West Tisbury | 51,454 | 94,025 P |
| (328) Westborough | 381,933 | 761,413 |
| (329) Westfield | 349,587 | 432,555 |
| (330) Westford | 232,942 | 305,519 E |
| (331) Westhampton | 8,173 | 26,653 P |
| (332) Westminster | 98,686 | 91,536 P |
| (333) Weston | 66,202 | 61,981 E |
| (334) Westport | 207,375 | 203,679 E |
| (335) Westwood | 167,264 | 160,034 E |
| (336) Weymouth | 554,608 | 712,877 E |
| (337) Whately | 21,959 | 13,368 P |
| (338) Whitman | 86,442 | 195,460 |
| (339) Wilbraham | 155,156 | 181,856 E |
| (340) Williamsburg | 31,501 | 61,709 P |
| (341) Williamstown | 224,993 | 196,113 P |
| (342) Wilmington | 206,468 | 404,288 |
| (343) Winchendon | 60,991 | 115,564 P |
| (344) Winchester | 137,038 | 141,934 |
| (345) Windsor | ** | 25,913 P |
| (346) Winthrop | 126,068 | 125,641 |
| (347) Woburn | 1,140,564 | 963,504 |
| (348) Worcester | 2,780,336 | 3,071,086 |
| (349) Worthington | 3,345 | 21,164 P |
| (350) Wrentham | 278,107 | 138,211 E |
| (351) Yarmouth | 813,521 | 819,287 |
| (co.) ramicali | 3 13/62 1 | 517,125 |
| Total for Small Towns (**) | 21,376 | |
| Total for the Rest | 124,978,624 | |
| TOTALS | 125,000,000 | 125,000,000 |

Midpoint Revenue Impact of One percentage Point Increase (from 5% to 6%) in Meals Tax Rate

Method: Using DOR Returns

(This method uses 2007 Meals Tax Return data to distribute the Aggregate Revenue Impact. Meals Tax From Out-of-State Returns (Mostly Restaurant Chains) is Distributed Proportionately to In-State Cities and Towns) Method: Using U.S. Census Department Data on Restaurant Sales, Number of Restaurants, or Population in a Locality (This method uses MA Economic Census data for NAICS code 722 (Food Services) to distribute the Aggregate Revenue Impact -- see footnotes)

CITIES and TOWNS

** Disclosure rules prohibit release of data where the number of taxpayers is less than 3; If some towns/Localities share same ZIP code, numbers may not E: By using establishment proportions. Only "establishment" data were available from the U.S. Census Bureau for these towns (there were no sales data P: By using population proportion. Neither "sales" nor "establishment" data were available from the U.S. Census Bureau for these towns.